The sixth chapter, treating of the constructive principles of the mediæval architects, is ably written, though containing much from which we differ. The author's opinion of the parish churches left by the mediæval builders is singularly erroneous: if he had given them the study they deserve, he would not say "those who built them were totally ignorant of the principles of that or any other architecture, repeating as well as they could the mere details, empty forms, or clothing, of the only architecture they saw—that of the scientific fraternity of Gothicists—without *the remotest conception of its meaning, motive, or principles!*"

Mr. Garbett has little hope for the future; "the general taste can never improve. Pure taste can never again prevail; but it can *fight*;" and to this he leaves it. He thinks we have a *national style*, and the view he gives of it is not very flattering to national character.

"More distinctly than the Egyptian piles speak of tyranny, slavery, and priestcraft;—more fully than the Greek express intellect, polish, and refinement;—more loudly than the Roman proclaim ambition and general energy;—more truly than the Gothic embody a religion, or rather a romantic devotion;—more than all, does every form and feature of the modern English style express fickleness, low cunning, hollow affectation, simulation, servility, and thought-flying hurry. What! are these then our national characters? No, but they are the characters of the *many* in every nation; and we are as yet the only nation that have a style of the many. I appeal to all who have ever returned to our shores, after a long absence, to say whether they could shut their eyes to the hateful expression that met them in every building;—whether they could at first walk our streets without being disgusted, and, if of a sensitive temperament, almost sickened, by the intensely marked character of the architecture."

We will simply add, that the principle which he points to as the basis for a new system is the *truss*, in opposition to the beam and the arch, the basis of past systems; and will conclude with a quotation which embodies much of what has been already said, and deserves constant consideration:—

"A retrospective glance at the history of the Gothic system, as of every other, will show us progress, as long as the object of the artists was *Truth*; decline, the moment that object became *Novelty*; progress, as long as minor and decorative forms were *imitated* from great structural and essential ones (but so modified as to be brought into a lower class, more curvilinear, more eumorphic, less architectural); decline, the moment structural forms were *copied* from decorative ones, and whenever copying was substituted for imitation: progress, wherever the great governed the little; decline, wherever the little governed the great; progress, whenever the problem was how to adorn a proposed construction; decline, whenever it was how to construct a proposed adornment; truth, whenever it was sought for its own sake; falsehood, when *any thing* else than truth was the object; truth, whenever the work was loved for its own sake; falsehood, whenever it was got through for the pay's sake; truth, as long as it was sought *how to lavish most thought on a given amount of work*; falsehood, as soon as it was sought *how to effect a given object with the least expenditure of thought.*"

DAMAGE FROM FALL OF HOARDING.—In Queen's-road, Brighton, a screen having been run up 25 feet, for the purpose of blocking up nearly all the windows of a rival establishment, the screen fell, and, as alleged, caused damage to the building; and a jury in the home circuit, before whom the case was lately brought, has given a verdict of 25*l.* damages: the point of legality in such an erection—the sole purpose of which was admitted—does not seem to have been considered.

HOW SHALL WE BUILD OUR CHURCHES?

I beg to offer a few remarks on a letter which appeared in your last number relative to a recent pamphlet of mine. I may premise that I am totally unacquainted with the writer, and therefore my observations must not be considered in the slightest degree personal, as I merely judge of his principles from his argument. I must say it was with no little surprise that I found myself attacked as the advocate of an artificial system of architecture, when not only by my writings but in my works I have always endeavoured to set forth that most important principle of *reality, both in design, material, and construction*, and of scrupulously avoiding all shams, or dressing-up of buildings with unreal features. But on a further perusal of the article, I felt satisfied that the writer belonged to a class of persons who are not in a position to comprehend the basis of my arguments, or the principles on which I, in common with so many persons usually termed ecclesiologists, advocate the restoration of ancient ecclesiastical architecture. It is evident that the writer's idea of a place of worship is nothing more than a preaching-room. What he calls a *common-sense church* is, in reality, no church at all, but a most decided *conventicle*. He would abolish pillars, as hindering a view of the preacher; he advocates galleries, as affording cheap accommodation to a large auditory; he objects to a deep chancel, as *diminishing* the voice of the clergyman (he evidently imagines a chancel is a preaching place); with him it is all *vox*, and, I may add, *præterea nihil*. I am willing to admit that his common-sense church is perfectly adapted for persons of his class, who are unable to enter either into the solemnities of religious worship, or the symbolism of ecclesiastical architecture; his great galleried room, with its flat roof and open space, is a very natural expression of a huge dissenting preaching-house; moreover, it possesses the advantage of being what is technically termed a convertible building; should the orator fail in collecting a sufficient auditory to pay the proprietors, by removing the pews and erecting an orchestra, it would make an excellent casino, with reserved seats in the galleries; or if that might be considered objectionable on moral grounds, or the neighbourhood too retired, by flooring it over in stages a most eligible set of coachmaker's premises are produced at a comparatively small additional outlay. Now I do not quarrel with this class of buildings in the abstract, for they are perfectly adapted to the purpose, and it would be exceedingly ridiculous and even painful to see a puritan whitening over his sepulchre, and putting on a catholic coat. But let not those whose ideas do not extend beyond such miserable edifices venture to set themselves up as standards of ecclesiastical architecture, and imagine that the temples of God are to be brought down to such a despicable level. Do not let them suppose that the erection of a great Christian church is a mere question of huddling a number of persons together, and covering them over in the most economical manner. No; the edifice must be so constructed as to symbolize the mysteries of religion, not only in its plan, but in all its arrangements and its minutest details,—an edifice that, both by its external form and internal disposition, bears unquestionable evidence of its sacred purpose. No one would think of putting forth a great cathedral, or pointed church, as either an economical building or one easily constructed, or even convenient, according to the modern acceptation of the term. The cruciform plan entails numerous practical difficulties, and yet it is the very foundation of every great church in Christendom. The enormous height, another remarkable symbolical feature, requires a vast deal of most costly and difficult construction. I do not imagine that the designs of the ancient church builders were framed with reference to economy or facility of erection; their great aim was to produce an edifice that should illustrate the majesty of its purpose, and they spared neither pains nor cost to accomplish this end. Their works bear on their face the indelible stamp of faith, love, and devotion, and it is the unearthly look of these glorious fanes which forms one of their greatest charms, and by which they are so nobly distinguished from all other architectural productions; now, as the faith of the church is unchangeable, the form and arrangements of an ancient church are just as appropriate for the nineteenth as for the thirteenth century; a noble pile, cruciform, lofty, and long, surmounted by spire-capped towers, surrounded by lateral aisles and chapels, provided with a screened choir and solemn sanctuary, with all its costly and beauteous furniture, is as much a natural expression of the Catholic religion in the present age as it was when the third Henry finished the choir of Westminster, or St. Louis dedicated the Holy Chapel of Paris. The externals of religion undoubtedly suffered a lamentable debasement during the last three centuries, but the *things* and *principles* remained, though under a distorted appearance; and by getting rid of this unnatural incrustation, and returning to the old and appropriate forms, we are not assuming a *disguise*, but only regaining our *natural habit*. Ancient forms for ancient rites is an undeniable proposition, and while we retain the old faith, we will retain that which it originally created for its service; hence we are fully justified in building the temples of God after the manner of our fathers, and not abandoning their wonderful traditions for modern expediency; indeed, a Catholic church should present, both in its architecture and arrangements, a striking contrast to the ordinary erections of the day. Civil architecture, owing to the natural constitution of society, is perpetually changing, and it would be great folly for any man, through an abstract love of mere antiquity, to oppose the modifications and constructive improvements that the altered state of society may require in domestic buildings. I have enlarged in some former publications on this very point, and was one of the first to expose the folly of reviving castles and other constructions, adapted only for mediæval warfare: whatever tends to public convenience, health, and prosperity, would be adopted by any reasonable man, and it would be preposterous, in edifices purely connected with commercial speculation, to diminish the returns by wasteful and extravagant architectural outlay. But I am moved to indignation when I find a man advocating the erection of religious edifices by the tariff of a warehouse, and lowering what should be the highest productions of human skill, to the level of mere building speculations. He is quite mistaken in ascribing my wish of massive buttresses and thick walls to a mere attainment of useless effect. If I had been able to erect them, I should have covered my chapels either with stone vaults or with roofs of a far more elaborate and appropriate character; his most scientific truss would be utterly disregarded by a true church builder: the temple of God is not to be roofed over like a station or fish-market; but the covering, both form and decoration, should symbolize that celestial region to which the worshippers beneath aspire. Let us examine one of those fine old roofs at March, Wymondham, St. Peter's, Mancroft, or any of the great timber-covered churches of the period, and what do we behold? A whole hierarchy of angels seem to hover over us, with outspread wings—they sally from every beam and corbel, and extend from bay to bay; in the hands some bear the emblems of the passion and man's salvation; others scrolls and phylacteries, with many a text and legend; each purlin, principal, plate, and rafter is richly moulded and twined with flowrets and tendrils. The deeply set pannels were once brilliant with stars and celestial bodies; the whole roof is glorious, and fully illustrates the inspired canticle—"O ye angels of the Lord, bless the Lord, praise him, and magnify him for ever. Oh, ye stars of heaven, bless the Lord, praise him, and magnify him for ever." When we consider these unrivalled roofs in all their bearings, their great variety of ornament and detail, the artistic beauty of their execution, and the symbolism and unity of their design, we must regard them as wonderful examples of ancient skill, and whatever improvements may have been effected in the scientific part of modern carpentry, it will be long before it produces a covering of such rich and harmonious beauty. Indeed, I should feel far greater satisfaction in having been the designer of one bay of those noble

To learn about OCR and PDF Compression go to our website